



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/882,172	06/14/2001	John Mark Hartel	AUS920010225USI	7996
35525	7590	04/08/2005	EXAMINER	
IBM CORP (YA)			KE, PENG	
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC			ART UNIT	
P.O. BOX 802333			PAPER NUMBER	
DALLAS, TX 75380			2174	

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/882,172

Applicant(s)

HARTEL ET AL.

Examiner

Peng Ke

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 37 and 39-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 37 and 39-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 1/18/05, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. The final rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

- (1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,
- (2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

This action is final.

Claims 1 – 41 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 13, 25, and 37 are independent claims. In the amendment, claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 21, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, 33, 37, and 39 - 41 were amended and claim 38 was cancelled.

This action is made Final.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an

Art Unit: 2174

international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3, 7-8, 13-15, 19-20, 25-27, 31-32, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Miller et al. (US 6,661,437).

As per claim 1, Miller teaches a method in a data processing system, for editing a property, comprising:

identifying one or more methods invoked by a property editor associated with the property; (See Miller figure 2; items 225, 230, 235, 240; Examiner interprets each item under setup to be a method associated with the property of setup)

selecting a graphical user interface based on the one or more methods invoked by the property editor; (See Miller figure 4, item 415, figure 5, item 545; Since GUI invoked for subtitle language is different from that of the Subtitle display therefore property editor selected a GUI based on the method) and

providing the graphical user interface for use in editing the property (figure 5, item 545).

As per claim 2, Miller teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the one or more methods invoked by the property editor identify one or more abilities of the property editor. (See Miller figure 4, item 415, figure 5, item 545)

As per claim 3, Miller teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the one or more methods invoked by the editor include one or more PropertyEditor Interface methods. (See Miller figure 4, item 415, figure 5, item 545)

As per claim 7, Miller teaches the method of claim 2, wherein if the one or more abilities include an ability to edit a property using tags, the graphical user interface includes at least one

Art Unit: 2174

of a popup choice selection area virtual button and a current selection display field. (See Miller col. 7, lines 1-36)

As per claim 8, Miller teaches the method of claim 7, wherein if the popup choice selection area virtual button is selected, a choice selection area popup is presented. (See Miller col. 7, lines 1-36)

As per claims 13-15 and 19-20, they are of similar scope to claims 1-3 and 7-8, respectively, and are rejected under the same rationale (see rejections above)

As per claims 25-27 and 31-32 they are of similar scope to claims 1-3 and 7-8, respectively, and are rejected under the same rationale (see rejections above)

As per claim 37, it is of the same scope as claim 3. (see rejection above)

38 is Cancelled

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-6, 16-18, and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller et al. (US 6,661,437) in view of Lindhorst et al. (US 6,337,696).

As per claim 4, Miller teaches the method of claim 2. However Miller fails to teach wherein if the one or more abilities include a text editing ability, the graphical user interface includes a text field entry area.

Lindhorst teaches the method wherein if the one or more abilities include a text

Art Unit: 2174

editing ability, the graphical user interface includes a text field entry area (see Lindhorst, column 18, lines 27 – 31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Lindhorst with the method of Miller in order to allow the user to edit properties that must be input as strings.

As per claim 5, Miller teaches the method of claim 4. However Miller fails to teach wherein if the one or more abilities include a text editing ability, the graphical user interface further includes an entry error indicator.

Lindhorst teaches the method wherein if the one or more abilities include a text editing ability, the graphical user interface further includes an entry error indicator (see Lindhorst, column 18, lines 54 – 57).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Lindhorst with the method of Miller in order to ensure that only valid input is received by the property editor.

As per claim 6, Miller teaches the method of claim 5. However Miller fails to teach wherein the entry error indicator is only visible when an entry in the text field entry area is invalid.

Lindhorst teaches the method of claim 5, wherein the entry error indicator is only visible when an entry in the text field entry area is invalid (see Lindhorst, column 18, lines 51 – 53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Lindhorst with the method of Miller in order to ensure that only valid input is received by the property editor.

As per claims 16 and 28, they are of similar scope to claim 4 and are rejected under the same rationale as claim 1. (see rejection above)

As per claims 17 and 29, they are of similar scope to claim 5 and are rejected under the same rationale as claim 1 (see rejection above).

As per claims 18 and 30, they are of similar scope to claim 6 and are rejected under the same rationale as claim 1 (see rejection above).

Claims 9, 12, 21, 24, 33, 36, and 40-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller et al. (US 6,661,437) in view of Zimmerman (US 6,208,336).

As per claim 9, Miller teaches the method of claim 2. However Miller fail to teaches wherein if the one or more abilities includes an ability to edit the property using a custom editor interface, the graphical user interface includes a popup custom component area virtual button.

Zimmerman wherein if the one or more abilities includes an ability to edit the property using a custom editor interface, the graphical user interface includes a popup custom component area virtual button (see Zimmerman, column 6, line 53 – 64; the examiner interprets the tabs representing property groups to be popup custom component area virtual button because by selecting a tab, a custom property sheet page is displayed).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Zimmerman with the method of Miller in order to provide a single application having only a desired functionality to users without requiring creation of several versions of the application.

As per claim 12, Miller and Zimmerman further teaches the method of claim 9.

Art Unit: 2174

Zimmerman further teaches wherein a custom component area is presented in response to selection of the popup custom component area virtual button, and wherein the custom component area includes a custom editor for the property. (see Zimmerman, column 6, lines 53 – 64; the examiner interprets a property sheet page as a custom component area including a custom editor for the property because it contains various properties of a specific type of object).

As per claim 21, it is of the same scope as claim 9. (See rejection above)

As per claim 24, it is of the same scope as claim 12. (See rejection above)

As per claim 33, it is of the same scope as claim 9. (See rejection above)

As per claim 36, it is of the same scope as claim 12. (See rejection above)

As per claim 40, Miller teaches the method of claim 37. However he fails to teach wherein if the one or more methods include a getTags method, the graphical user interface includes a popup choice selection area virtual button and a current selection display field.

Zimmerman teaches wherein if the one or more methods include a getTags, method, the graphical user interface includes a popup choice selection area virtual button and a current selection display field (see Zimmerman, column 8, lines 55 – 60; the examiner interprets the GetPredefinedStrings method to be a getTags method).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Zimmerman with the method of Miller in order to provide a single application having only a desired functionality to users without requiring creation of several versions of the application.

As per claim 41, Miller teaches the method of claim 21. However he fails to teach wherein if the one or more methods includes at least one of a supportsCustomEditor method and



a getCustomEditor method, the graphical user interface includes a popup custom component area virtual button.

Zimmerman teaches wherein if the one or more methods includes at least one of a supportsCustomEditor method and a getCustomEditor method, the graphical user interface includes a popup custom component area virtual button (see Zimmerman, column 9, lines 1 – 17; the examiner interprets the MapPropertyToPage method as a getCustomEditor method).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Zimmerman with the method of Miller in order to provide a single application having only a desired functionality to users without requiring creation of several versions of the application.

Claims 10, 11, 22, 23, 34, 35 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller et al. (US 6,661,437) in view of Zimmerman (US 6,208,336) further in view of Lindhorst et al. (US 6,337,696).

As per claim 10, Miller and Zimmerman teach the method of claim 9. Zimmerman further teaches the method of claim 9, wherein if the one or more abilities includes an ability to edit the property using a custom editor interface. Miller and Zimmerman do not teach wherein the graphical user interface further includes at least one of a text entry field and an entry error indicator. Lindhorst teaches wherein the graphical user interface further includes at least one of a text entry field and an entry error indicator (see Lindhorst, column 18, lines 27 – 31 and Lindhorst, column 18, lines 54 – 57).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Lindhorst with the method of Miller and Zimmerman in order to allow the user to edit properties that must be input as strings and to ensure that only valid input is received by the property editor.

As per claim 11, Miller and Zimmerman teach the method of claim 10. They fail to teach wherein the entry error indicator is only displayed when an invalid entry is entered in the text field entry area. Lindhorst teaches wherein the entry error indicator is only displayed when an invalid entry is entered in the text field entry area (see Lindhorst, column 18, lines 51 – 53). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Lindhorst with the method of Miller and Zimmerman in order to ensure that only valid input is received by the property editor.

As per claims 22 and 34, they are of similar scope to claim 10 and are rejected under the same rationale as claim 1 (see rejection above).

As per claims 23 and 35, they are of similar scope to claim 11 and are rejected under the same rationale as claim 1 (see rejection above).

As per claim 39, which is dependent on claim 37. Miller teaches the method of claim 37. However, he fails to teach wherein one or more methods includes at least one of a `getAsText` method and a `setAsText` method.

Zimmerman teaches wherein one or more methods includes at least one of a `getAsText` method and a `setAsText` method (see Zimmerman, column 8, lines 18 – 20; the examiner interprets the `GetDisplayString` method as a `getAsText` method).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to incorporate the method of Zimmerman with the method of Miller in order to provide a single application having only a desired functionality to users without requiring creation of several versions of the application.

Miller and Zimmerman do not teach wherein if the one or more methods includes at least one of a getAsText method and a setAsText method, the graphical user interface includes a text field entry area and an entry error indicator. Lindhorst teaches wherein if one or more methods includes receiving a string input, the graphical user interface includes a text field entry area and an entry error indicator (see Lindhorst, column 18, lines 27 – 31 and lines 48 – 57).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Lindhorst with the method of Miller and Zimmerman in order to allow the user to edit properties that must be input as strings and to ensure that only valid input is received by the property editor.

#### **Responds to Argument**

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-37 and 39-41 have been considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

#### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO**

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peng Ke whose telephone number is (571) 272-4062. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and Alternate Fridays 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Peng Ke

*Kristine Kincaid*  
KINETIC  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100